

REMARKS

Claim 1-12 are pending. The Final Action dated April 21, 2005 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1-6 and 8-10 have been amended in this Response. Claims 7, 11, and 12 were withdrawn from consideration in a previous Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,330,606 to Logue et al. (“Logue”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,534,875 to Diefes et al. (“Diefes”). Insofar as these rejections may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are deemed overcome by the foregoing amendments.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the “service portal automation control module (ACM)” is a “service-portal enabled automation control module (ACM) of a type” connected to second memory that stores “service-portal data specific to said ACM” and to a remote network server that stores “data relating to the type of said ACM.” (Emphasis added).

The Examiner acknowledges that Logue does not suggest, teach, or disclose the utilization of telemetry data. Specifically, Logue is directed to accessing database information over a computer network. The present invention of Claim 1, though, allows for database access over a computer network, but also allows for telemetry data to be uploaded. For example, limit/proximity switch status, object position, pressure, and temperature of devices can be directed uploaded. By allowing for the usage of telemetry data, customers can more easily access correct information even without customer troubleshooting or analysis. Therefore, the efficiency of the ACM for information is greater than that of Logue.

The deficiencies of Logue are not remedied by Diefes. Diefes relates to an altitude determining system for use with a global positioning system. However, neither Diefes nor Logue disclose or suggest a service-portal enabled automation control module (ACM) of a type" connected to a second memory that stores "service-portal data specific to said ACM" or to a remote network server that stores "data relating to the type of said ACM," as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). The "data specific to said ACM" stored in the second memory may include information specific to the ACM unit such as its configuration file. *See, e.g.*, Specification, par. 20). The "data relating to the type of said ACM" stored in the remote network server may include information relating to the type of ACM, such as pricing, data sheets, application notes, etc. *See, e.g.*, Specification, par. 19).

The features of the present invention of Claim 1, as amended, allow customers to readily obtain the most relevant information on their ACM's. For example, if the "data specific to said ACM" indicates that it has a certain configuration that has since been updated, the customer can be automatically informed of the need to update the configuration file, without the customer having to make a request for this information. If the customer needs other information concerning the type of ACM, such as pricing, data sheets, application notes, etc for the type of ACM possessed by the customer, the customer can access the "data relating to the type of said ACM" stored in the remote network server. Furthermore, because the second memory that stores the data specific to the particular ACM is operatively linked to the remote network server, the information specific to the particular ACM need not be manually input by the customer to obtain such information from the remote network server. This increases customer convenience as well as reducing the possibility for manual errors.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that

amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over these references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over Logue in view of Diefes be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 3-4, 6, and 8-10 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 3-4, 6, and 8-10 also be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Logue and U.S. Patent No. 6,557,026 to Stephens et al. (“Stephens”). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are deemed overcome.

Claims 2 and 5 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 2 and 5 also be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-6 and 8-10.

Applicant does not believe that any additional fees are due; however, in the event that any other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
30GF-9094

PATENT APPLICATION
SERIAL NO. 09/682,280

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: July 21, 2005
CARR LLP
670 Founder's Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3032
Fax: (214) 760-3003


Theodore F. Shiells
Reg. No. 31,569